

# The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1860.

NO. 12.

## The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above  
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above

### PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

For "The Principia"

### FEDERAL PROTECTION OF PERSONAL LIBERTY.

Mr. Goodell.—Permit me, through your paper, to express the course of argument by which I have assured my mind, that it is the constitutional prerogative and duty of the Federal Government to make personal liberty universal, within its limits.

Every free man and every lover of freedom must acknowledge that slavery is no more than a matter of local appointment. But is it not necessary to go further and deny the right of the State to create any such institutions as interfere with the rights of citizens of the National government? The leaders of the Republican party acknowledge—carelessly or erroneously—that power resides in the States to maintain the system within their jurisdiction, and over their citizens. This seems to be a confession unwarranted by the Constitution.

1st. Are there any citizens of the United States? Does that government confer upon any of the inhabitants of its territory the rights of citizenship?

This is an important question. It certainly does. If not, under what government do those live who reside in the Territories and in the District of Columbia? Or, are they not citizens at all? for they are not of the States. One fact is sufficient to prove what we want. The Constitution does recognize that the Federal Government is to confer citizenship, by making peculiar provision for those who shall fill the offices created under it, and for those who shall help to elect those officers *as to whom they shall be*, and this, without any reference to what may be the Law or Constitution of the States in which these citizens (thus constituted such) may reside. It seems useless to argue that a Government, founded in good faith, as such, is *not* a Government, and cannot choose its citizens, or maintain their rights.

2d. What are the rights of citizenship thus bestowed? In the fewest words, and enough for our purpose, the right to hold life, liberty, and property, unless deprived "by due process of law." That provision is sufficient to protect all who are citizens of this government from the institution of slavery, quite sufficient, for slavery deprives of all, without due process of law.

3. To whom does the Federal Government afford these immunities? To all but those specially exempted; for the general purpose of the Constitution is declared to be the preservation and perpetuation of personal liberty.

4th. How are these exceptions, if there are any, to be interpreted? and by whom is the application of every saving, excepting clause, to be decided? Not by the officers or the Judiciary of the several States. The Supreme Court of the United States was established to procure a uniform interpretation of law. Then, it must decide the first condition of law, before whom it is binding, who profits by it. Of course

the Judiciary of the Federal Government decides the question of its own citizenship. To this body all appeals from State Tribunals are made, and it must decide all cases of citizenship which are appealed.

5th. If these powers reside in the Federal Judiciary, under the Constitution, what possible authority can be possessed by any other organization, to institute such systems as destroy its whole effect? It decides that this man is a citizen of the United States, holding his right to life, liberty, and property under the guarantees of the Constitution—can South Carolina make him a slave in the face of that decision? Such would be a cause of war, between nationalities.

Statesmen have repeatedly affirmed that they had no ulterior design upon the existence of slavery, simply because, as they conceived Congress has no right to interfere with the peculiar institutions of the States, or to legislate for them. True, it is; and it is true that the States may regulate their domestic institutions, but not establish them against the spirit of the Constitution. The National Government may not interfere with them as *institutions*, but as *institutions affecting men*. No power resides in Congress to interfere with the relation of the master to the slave; but we must admit that power resides *somewhere* to regulate the relation of the citizen to the government, and to assert the rights possessed by each, and the obligations existing between them. Where, but in the Supreme Court, can this power be found? Who doubts that the United States Government may declare the black man to be its citizen? Then no State would treat him as a slave.

Slavery can never be abolished as a matter of legislation, but as an *infraction of the rights of citizens of the United States*, it may become a subject for the consideration of our Executive. This seems to be the just position—the power to abolish slavery at once, and without legislation, belongs to the joint action of the Federal Executive and the Federal Judiciary. For, be it remembered, that the abolition of slavery is but the execution of the absolute provisions of the Constitution as they may justly be interpreted by the proper authority. We read the recent and previous decisions of the Supreme Court, in regard to the condition of the slave;—with disgust at their baseness, and treachery to humanity and truth; but never with any question or doubt as to the Constitutional privilege of that body to judge the claims of any person to citizenship. Now, reverse that decision; let it read that the slave is, by no provision or principle of our law, deprived of those rights of citizenship, which he possesses by virtue of residing within the limits of the Government; let it read, that the slave—the black man—is a citizen, as it now decides that he is *not*; and no power on earth—no act of legislation on the part of any one of the several States, can deprive him of those rights to person and property which he holds as the immunities of his citizenship.

With such a decision, it would not be infringing upon the just authority of the States to protect him; any more than it would be an injury to the rights of Great Britain, to do the same in her case under similar circumstances. She has no such rights.—Suppose that the State is sovereign, so is the Federal Government, so is Great Britain. Outrage on the citizens of other States, is no prerogative of sovereignty. Our Government has the right to protect the subject wherever he may be, whether in Georgia, or in Sardinia. The fact that Georgia is within the confederacy, gives that State no ground of interference with the claims of the citizens of the Federal Government. In this respect, she stands on the same footing with foreign States, for all States must stand, on such questions, alike. And who will deny that our Executive may interfere, and act, in behalf of injured subjects *abroad*? Once establish the fact that the man is a citizen of the United States, and his rights must be asserted and

maintained against all outrage and interference from all independent, and all subordinate Governments. *Let those decisions of the Supreme Court be reversed*, as they may be, and should be; it becomes the duty of the Executive branch of the Federal Government, to take immediate action in view of it, to interfere decisively in behalf of millions of our citizens, oppressed in certain States; as it would if Russia should treat them as slaves.

"State Rights!" Suppose, that the several States were to enact laws making it allowable to sell to the highest bidder the members of the different branches of the National Government, who resided within their limits, as soon as they were elected! Yet they have as full Constitutional power to do this, as to make the black man property, or to sell the rightful constituents of those offices.

The power totally to abolish slavery in every State, resides in the Executive and Judiciary of the Federal Government;—to do this merely by annulling past, unnatural, untrue, unjust, unconstitutional decisions of the Supreme Court. Slavery may then exist theoretically, as now. But, no citizen of the United States, can be affected by it—no man can be its victim.

F. A. W.

[NOTE. We regard the preceding view of our Correspondent a very important one, and well adapted to meet the objections of a large class of persons, who, somehow find a difficulty in admitting that Congress has a right to abolish slavery in the States. Our own belief is that Congress, as well as the Judiciary and Executive has the power. And whether the action be called abolishing interfering with State institutions, or with the relation of master and slave—or whether it be called regulating the conditions of citizenship, and protecting the citizens of the National Government—it all comes to the same thing. They cannot be separated, where the condition of slavery is concerned. And if the Judiciary and Executive do not do their duty in the premises, it is, in our judgment, the business of Congress to support the Constitution by appropriate legislation. On another point we might dissent. The Supreme Federal Court, in our view, is not exclusively invested with the prerogative of interpreting law, or of establishing uniform interpretations of it. Yet this furnishes no reason why it should not, within its sphere, interpret, nor why the Executive should not enforce. Conflicts of judicial decisions are safeguards of freedom, when freedom is invaded, either by the State or Federal authorities, and this is one of the main benefits of our Federative system. But "F. A. W.," is decidedly correct in maintaining the just powers of the Federal Courts, and in saying that nothing is wanting but their just exercise, in order to the abolition of slavery. The friends of liberty are not wise, when, in view of its unrighteous decisions, they seek to disparage its constitutional powers.—EDITOR OF PRINCIPIA.]

For The Principia.

### THE CONSTITUTIONAL OATH.

No. II.

Not very long since, at a session of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Bushnell and Langston, convicted of a violation of the Fugitive Slave Law, made application for a discharge. The Court, a minority dissenting, refused the application on grounds substantially as follows:

That the Constitution guarantees to the owner of an escaped slave, a right of reclamation, that a citizen who interferes for the rescue of such a slave, is guilty of violating the Constitution, whether the Fugitive Slave Law is constitutional or not; that the question is not whether the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 is unconstitutional or not, in certain particulars, but whether Congress has any power to pass any law whatever for the reclamation of slaves; that such a power has been acquiesced in, by all departments both of the Federal and State Governments from an early time;



and that the question of such a power being affirmatively decided by the highest legislative and judicial authority, this Court cannot overrule the decision by an opinion of its own.

Now, without stopping to remark upon the loose thinking, the recklessness, and historical falsehood of the above decision, let us suppose that the fear of God had raised the Court above the fear of man, that it had been duly impressed with the binding obligation of the oath, and with a desire to administer justice; and then see how easily and naturally the Court might have sustained itself, both by the Constitution and by history, in an opinion like the following.

"The Constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law is the first question before this Court. This question must be determined by a direct reference to the Constitution itself. No weight of legislative and judicial authority, no long continued sanction of that law, can authorize this Court to adhere to it, if it is unconstitutional. Now, if we examine the Constitution diligently, we find not one word in it about slaves. It secures a right of service. But a right of service and a right of ownership in the servant, are very different things. The latter is not recognized, and of course the former cannot be recognized as resting on the latter. The service, to be secured by the Constitution must be 'due' either legally or morally. But one cannot owe service, as property, either morally or legally. It is doing violence to language to say that extorted and unrequited service can be due. And this Court cannot put violent constructions on language, for a purpose that would defeat the aim of the Constitution to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty to the people; nor can it go out of the Constitution into assumed history to find a warrant for the cruelties of rendition, as has been done.

"If the Court were disposed to rest the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law on authorities, it could find for that law but slender support. The Act of 1793 was never recognized by any State Government, till 1812, or nineteen years after the Act was passed. No case under the Act came before the Supreme Court of the Union till 1842, when the Act was forty-nine years old. This tardiness excites suspicion but surprise. Is there not ground to apprehend something wrong about the passing of the Act? The thought of delivering up an unfortunate man to the wrongs of slavery is revolting to our sense of justice and feeling of humanity; to deliver up one who runs away from a service that he honestly owes, is quite a different thing. If the Act of 1793 aimed at the reclamation of slaves and not of persons who really owe service, its cruel intent was not honestly expressed on the face of the Act, for it says nothing about slaves. Did all the members of Congress who voted for the Act understand its intent? Had the people then learned to understand 'person held to service' as meaning 'slave'? If they had not, then we have an explanation of the otherwise unaccountable fact that no great national sensation attended the passing of the Act like that which its amendment produced in 1850. If the amendment shocked the Union, could the original Act have done less with its unrighteous intent fairly expressed?

"On a question of constitutionality, this court could be satisfied with no authority short of the authority of the people. But how have the people always regarded the Fugitive Slave Law? The fact that the law of 1793 was entirely inoperative for at least twenty years from its passage, that it needed an amendment to give it effect, that the amendment was not ventured on, till fifty-seven years after the law was passed, and that it is even now a general failure, is anything but a sign that the people, who are the sovereigns, ever, by their Constitution, consented to the wrong of surrendering the escaped victims of slavery. Had the popular sentiment of the nation given prompt effect to the Act of 1793, it might have shown that the people felt themselves constitutionally bound to sustain it. But its failure proves the contrary with far greater force, than its absence could have done.

"An incident occurred in 1796, which illustrates the national sentiment at that time. President Washington, who, three years before, had signed the fugitive Act, desired to reclaim a female slave escaped to New Hampshire. In a letter from Philadelphia, dated November 28, to Mr. Whipple, Collector of Portsmouth, requesting that she might be returned, he said: 'I do not mean, however, by this request that such violent measures should be used as would excite a mob or riot, which might be the case if she has adherents;

or even uneasy sensations in the minds of well disposed citizens.' Mr. Whipple in his reply, dated December 22, engaged to return the woman, if he could do it without the consequences which Washington wished to avoid. But she was never returned, but lived free, to old age. Not even for Washington, would the people permit the wrong of rendition. No wonder the Act was a dead letter, and that Washington did not choose to try its efficacy."

If the above manner of showing how the constitutional oath should be observed, is deemed singular, it is hoped that the reader will pardon it. The extract from Washington's letter was published from the autograph, by Mr. Sumner, in his constitutional argument against slavery, delivered August 26, 1852.

I. S.

For The Principia.

## BEECHER ON SLAVERY.

The Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, has recently been having a somewhat interesting discussion in relation to the pro-slavery character of the American Board, and the propriety of continuing their contributions to its support. On Monday evening last, Mr. Beecher, their Pastor, came to the defense of the Board; and in doing so, seems to have changed front altogether on the slavery question. He said, when anti-slavery was unpopular, he defended it: now he would defend the rights of those who were called pro-slavery. This, if it means anything relevant to the question in hand, means that Mr. B. will defend their claim to Christian character and fellowship. This may be chivalrous, but it doesn't sound like Beecher, as we have heard him thunder from Plymouth Pulpit, against slaveholding and pro-slavery sinners under the guise of religious profession.

But the radical fault of Mr. Beecher's position, lies deeper than a mere apology for pro-slavery church members. It is found in his statement, that "nothing is bad in itself, or good in itself; that there may be unselfish slaveholding, that a man may be in circumstances where he cannot emancipate his slaves, and, therefore, cannot help being a slaveholder."

Now this would sound well enough from the lips of south side clergymen, such as Mr. Beecher is wont to show up to his congregation in no way to their advantage. But for one like the Pastor of the Plymouth Church, who is accustomed to proclaim the immutable holiness of God, the unchangeableness of His law, the instant duty of sinners to repent and put away their sins, and that there can be no circumstances of external pressure that can act as an absolute bar to such repentance, to utter doctrines so flatly in contradiction to his ordinary preachings, and so plainly at variance with sound ethical philosophy, is a thing to fill one with sadness and amazement.

"Nothing bad in itself—nothing good in itself." This is a comprehensive denial of all abstract principles. God is not good, in Himself—The Devil is not bad, in himself. There is no such thing as abstract justice, no such entity as abstract right. All arguments *a priori* are fallacious. It will be no more possible to determine an effect by studying the nature of its cause, for cause can have no quality and force by and of itself for good or evil. Such is the doctrine of Mr. Beecher, stated more in detail; a doctrine that leaves us no principle or law by which to try the quality of things.

How contrary to all this are the teachings of Christ, an expounder of whose doctrines Mr. Beecher claims to be. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit: 'either make the tree good and the fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt and the fruit corrupt.' Here the tree is itself good or bad. But Mr. Beecher says nothing is good or bad in itself: it is only good or bad according to its results. But it is manifest that there could be no such thing as good or bad results from anything, legitimately, that was not either good or bad in itself, unless you can have an effect without a cause. The fruits of a thing neither good nor bad in itself, would themselves be utterly without moral quality. So that if the fruits of slavery are bad, it must be because slavery itself is bad. To talk, therefore, about unselfish slaveholding, is the same as to talk about unselfish stealing, innocent and honest thieves, for the first act in slaveholding, is the supreme robbery.

Then Mr. Beecher speaks of certain cases in which it might be impossible to emancipate a slave. Then there must be cases in which it may be impossible to "cease to do

evil;" impossible to put away our sin. Now this is absurd so long as there remains will to man. For if I will set my slave free, no power on earth can prevent me. For, though the Government might forbid me; though it might refuse to execute the legal papers, still, if I renounce the relation, refuse to recognize the right of property in my fellow-man, or to use his labor without wages, or to exercise any one of the powers of slavery over him, the Government may become the slaveholder, by declaring him still a slave, but I certainly cease to be such. And this is the plain and instant duty of every slaveholder in defiance of all authority with pains and penalties to the contrary.

If Mr. Beecher endeavors to stand on the pro-slavery doctrine he has now laid down for himself, he must fall. This is not the time to take a retrograde movement; the onward progress of the cause of freedom and justice must sweep down conservatives and apologists for slavery under any circumstances. The Pastor of Plymouth Church must retreat from the ground he has taken, or the power of his ministry has culminated, and this blazing star must go down suddenly from its zenith of glory.

D. PLUMB,

New York, January 28, 1860.

## Ancient Paganism and Modern Slaveholding Christianity.

The reproduction of ancient Paganism under the guise of modern Christianity is a very curious phenomenon. It is presented in that phase of Atheism through which the priests of a slaveholding Democracy are now dragging the religion of our own State and country. The political throne is set above the religious, and the conscience towards God is subject to a first mortgage upon it, held by the State, which is ready to foreclose at any time. We find in the first volume of Neander's Church-History, a very instructive passage, in his account of the causes of the persecutions of the early Christians. "Ideas," he says, "of the universal rights of man, of universal religious freedom and liberty of conscience, were altogether foreign to the views of the ancient world. Nor could it well be otherwise; for with them the idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics, the end and realization of the supreme good. Consequently, the development of whatever else is good, or an object of human desire, was made dependent on this. And so even the religious element also was subordinate to the political. They knew of none but State religions and National gods.

Here we are exactly. This State religion is set up as supreme by the apostles of the modern slaveholding Democracy, and they and their organs acknowledge nothing higher, but would put every man's conscience and piety under bonds to this. The religious element is subordinated to the political, and the theological doctrine of this subordination may be found in the columns of *Observers*, *Expresses*, and *Journals of Commerce*, standing in the old paths of Pagan antiquity, and interpreting the higher law as a mere insurance for the lower.

"It was Christianity," continues Neander, "that first of all and alone substituted more enlarged views of this narrow principle of antiquity. Instead of National deities, and the paramount obligation of political ties, it taught men to worship the one God of all human beings, and to see in all men alike the common image of that one God, while in the place of the State as the center of human interest, it substituted a universal kingdom of God, embracing and superior to all human politics. Looked at from this point of view, which was the one actually taken by the ancient world, a defection from the religion of the State could not appear otherwise than as a crime against the State."

Now here we are again exactly. Slaveholding and the sacredness of slave property being the religion of the State, a defection from that religion is a crime against the State. It must be regarded as high treason, and if the laws are not sufficiently explicit in regard to this, they must be made so, and laws must be passed, under which an invasion of the sacredness of slave property may be punished as treason against God and the Federal Government. The Christianity that of old substituted the worship of God for the worship of mere national deities, now sets up this latest form of the National religion and its political ties as supreme; and makes the worship of the National deity to be the worship of God.

Neander goes on to show that "in the ancient Roman world its exclusive political principle engrossed every other interest. Its influence is distinctly recognizable in the Principle which Cicero lays down as a fundamental maxim of legislation. No man shall have any particular gods of his own: no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they have been publicly recognized by law. This feeling suggested the advice of Mecenas to Augustus, expressing the prevailing sentiments of the Roman statesmen of that period: 'Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and

compel all  
duce anythHere we  
ern slaveh  
and of pra  
by that Co  
any who o  
ed as blasp  
that cameAgain N  
the Roman  
the minds  
punished  
of view pr  
come into  
Roman citi  
of which th  
religion, n  
appeared a  
rection ag  
sus, for eve  
ert them is  
times, of l  
tians.Just so n  
from the re  
O'Connor ex  
the priesth  
if all the sl  
sinful to off  
the laws.  
preme. An  
tion of the  
is to glorifyIt is won  
pounders o  
tique perfec  
eminent ch  
ty. Archbi  
ancient tim  
parents on  
of Athens,  
the people  
were then a  
for slaves.In all thi  
brave, that  
rice their  
ordination o  
political int  
reasonable aThere are  
take the fol  
tary on Exo  
"It is the  
harshly tre  
terpose, lest  
done, witho  
nothing oug  
by their fro  
sent.""The mid  
verential fee  
the threaten  
draws from  
excusable co  
solemn com  
the wicked  
ing in some  
of cruelty;  
take no acco  
they obey th  
in ordaining  
every earthl  
not rather m  
only seek to  
obedience, le  
the example  
condemnation  
mends those  
cause they feSome of ou  
and to hang  
letters in theNEBRASKA.  
as was expect



compel all others to do the same. But those who would introduce anything foreign in this particular, hate and punish."

Here we are again, and this is precisely the religion of the modern slaveholding politicians, with their Supreme Court of justice and of prayer. The Constitution and the laws, as interpreted by that Court, are enthroned as "the Bible of the people," and any who oppose that interpretation, are to be hated and punished as blasphemers of the great slaveholding image and principle that came down from heaven.

Again Neander remarks that it was a principle of civil law in the Roman State that any man introducing a religion whereby the minds of men might be disturbed, should be banished or punished by death. "In this principle we have the two points of view presented, under which Christianity would necessarily come into collision with the laws of the State. 1. It seduced Roman citizens from the religion of the State, to the observance of which they were bound by the laws. 2. It introduced a new religion, not admitted by the laws of the State." Christianity appeared as a defection not allowed by the laws, and an insurrection against a venerable national faith. It is right, said Celsus, for every people to reverence their ancient laws, but to desert them is a crime. Hence the accusation, so dangerous is those times, of high treason, which was brought against the Christians.

Just so now, the higher law is denounced, as seducing citizens from the religion of the State, and endangering the Union. Mr. O'Connor expounds the doctrine of the State religion, and others of the priesthood accompany the exposition with the assurance that if all the slaves could be set free by a single prayer, it would be sinful to offer it. Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws. They are your Bible. The political interest is supreme. And the slaveholding interest is the climax and perfection of the political. The chief end of man, in a civilized State, is to glorify slavery and enjoy it forever.

It is wonderful to see in how many ways the priests and expounders of this State religion are bringing us back to its antique perfection. The turning of free negroes into slaves is an eminent characteristic of growth in grace under this kind of piety. Archbishop Potter cites the law propounded by Pericles in ancient times, to the effect that those only who were born of parents on both sides Athenians, should be reputed true citizens of Athens, all others to be made slaves. Having prevailed upon the people to give their consent, little less than five thousand were then and there at once deprived of their freedom, and sold for slaves.

In all things we improve. Our State piety is so strong and brave, that it does not have to ask the people for leave to sacrifice their liberties. It can count upon so disinterested a subordination of all questions of conscience and of freedom to the political interests of their rulers, that such a sacrifice is but a reasonable service.

There are, it is true, a few authorities on the other side. We take the following paragraphs from old John Calvin's Commentary on Exodus:

"It is the common duty of all believers, when the innocent are harshly treated, to take their part, and as far as possible to interpose, lest the stronger should prevail. It can scarcely be done, without exasperating those who are disposed to evil; but nothing ought to allow us to be silent, while justice is violated by their frowardness. For in this case, silence is a kind of consent."

"The midwives feared God. Sustained and supported by reverential fear of God, they boldly de-pised the commands and the threatenings of Pharaoh. Those whom the fear of men withdraws from the right course, betray by their cowardice, an inexcusable contempt of God, in preferring the favor of men to his solemn commands. Under pretext of due submission, they obey the wicked will of kings, in opposition to justice and right, being in some cases the ministers of avarice and rapacity, in others of cruelty; yea, to gratify the transitory kings of earth, they take no account of God. They plead the frivolous excuse that they obey their princes according to the Word of God; as if he, in ordaining princes, had resigned his rights to them; and as if every earthly power which exalts itself against heaven, ought not rather more justly be made to give way. But since they only seek to escape the reprobation of men for their criminal obedience, let them be referred to the judgment of women. For the example of those midwives is abundantly sufficient for their condemnation, especially when the Holy Spirit himself commends those faithful ones, as not having obeyed the King, 'because they feared God.'"

Some of our editors would do well to consider this example, and to hang up John Calvin's Speech along with John Brown's letters in their counting-rooms.—*Dr. Cheever in the Independent.*

NEBRASKA.—The "Democratic" Governor of Nebraska has, as was expected, vetoed the bill passed by the Legislature, for

the exclusion of slavery from the Territory. This is "leaving the people perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way" with a vengeance.—*National Era.*

#### TREASON.

BRO. GOODSELL.—Whenever a word is said, or an act is done in opposition to the existence of slavery *where it is*, the "hue and cry" of "TREASON" is raised by those in its interest. This is nothing new! As long ago as 850 years before Christ, we find this same *will* set up by those who were not permitted to go on, undisturbed, in a high course of sin and rebellion against a Just and Holy God.

During the reign of Jehoram, between 809, and 810 years before Christ, he, (the king), was persuaded by Athaliah, his wife, to subvert the worship of the Lord, and introduce the corruptions which prevailed in the sister kingdoms. For this, the prophet Elisha denounced the "Divine vengeance" upon him, and upon his house—which vengeance was speedily executed. This is the inevitable consequence, where the expressed will of the Great Jehovah is disregarded. This same "Divine vengeance" is being, and will continue to be visited upon the slaveholders of this nation, until they repent in "sackcloth and ashes," and obey the expressed will of God, in letting the "oppressed go free."

Jehoram and Athaliah, in order to carry out their wicked purposes, murdered the six brothers of the former. Slavery has sacrificed not only six, but thousands of victims to appease the wrath of its veracious god. This wicked king died of a "horrible disease," as a punishment for his sin. The slaveholder, unless he repents speedily, is destined to die a more "horrible" death—*blood*—as a punishment for his sin; and a guilty nation will share his fate, unless it repents and obeys the will of god, in setting the oppressed free, and refusing to return the servant who has escaped, to his master.

When Athaliah saw that her son, Ahaziah, who succeeded his father, was dead, she resolved to take the sovereign power into her own hands. She, being a very wicked woman, ruled Judah with a high hand, and established the worship of Baal throughout the land, and persecuted the faithful few who still adhered to the worship of Jehovah. The people became so incensed at her conduct, that the high priest, produced Joash, then but seven years old, who was declared king. On the day set apart to proclaim him king, the avenues and gates of the Temple being strictly guarded, the blasts of the trumpets; and the shouts and acclamations of the people, attracted the attention of Athaliah, who, up to this moment, was ignorant of what was going on, repaired to the Temple. She saw at a glance the hated truth, that she was about to be deprived of her power, and her wicked career brought to an end, and in her wrath, she cried out "Treason!" but this did not appear to disturb the people, for they were willingly led by the high priest, to destroy her temple and idols of Baal; and after being thus deprived of her power, this wicked woman died a violent death, as a punishment for her high-handed iniquities.

Those persons in the interests of slavery in this nation, are daily committing deeds of violence and crime, equal, at the least, in magnitude, to those of Athaliah. They are ruling the people with a "high-hand," and endeavoring to make them fall down and worship Baal. Four millions of God's images are compelled to *worship* their masters, after the flesh, instead of the living God. If those who are nominally free, refuse to worship their Baal, (as in the case of John Brown), they *must* be immolated upon the altar of slavery; and when any portion of the people, undertake to crown *Truth and Right*, king, the cry at once comes up, "Treason, Treason."

We have a full verification of this in the matter of the Harper's Ferry outbreak. This cry of Treason is only borrowed from that wicked woman, who being similarly situated, seeing the sceptre about to depart from her, in consequence of her sin against God, cried out in the agony of despair, "Treason." Is not this true of those in the interest of slavery? Do not they see the hand-writing upon the wall? and are they not constrained to cry out "Treason," because they see and feel that God will not much longer wink at their great iniquities?

What had the people of Judah done, that should cause Athaliah to cry out "Treason?" They had committed no sin in the sight of God; but were, on the contrary, carrying

out His expressed will. This woman's idolatry had become so offensive, that they could no longer endure it.

Is there no analogy between this, and the case of the advocates of slavery in America? God, in His word, clearly denounces slavery as a sin, punishable with death. He says: "He that stealeth a man, or if he be found in his hand, shall surely be put to death." What better right have the pro-slavery men of this day to cry out "Treason" against those who are endeavoring to release the slave from his chains, than had Athaliah to cry out "Treason," when she was about to be shorn of her power for wickedness? Christ clearly enjoins it upon us, to do unto others, as we would have others do unto us. Were this the only record we had left us upon this subject, it would be a sufficient warrant to us, to use all lawful means in our power to abolish slavery, but our duty, in this particular, is clearly set forth in all His teachings.

The command to us to abolish slavery, is as plain as it was to the high-priest and people to displace Athaliah, and our duty in the matter is just as apparant. Slavery is as wicked as her conduct could have been, and of the same character. We should not be alarmed at the cry of "Treason!" We may expect this. It has been so for more than twenty-six hundred years, and will continue to be so, while wickedness is permitted to retain the mastery. Let us obey the commands of God as did the people in the removal of Athaliah, by bringing about the total abolition of American slavery, and our labors will be crowned with as great success as were theirs. They did not attempt the fallacy of "preventing the extension" of her wickedness; or of confining it where it was; but removed it, altogether. In this, let us, also, imitate their example.

The pro-slavery men of this nation should take warning at the fate of this wicked woman, and flee from the wrath to come—as come it *will*, as sure as there is a God in Heaven who rules in righteousness. The day is coming, and, to all human appearance is not far distant, when slavery must terminate in blood, unless those who are committing the great wrong, repent of their sin, and "let the oppressed go free!"

The arrows of death—to the institution—are already wafting their way from the Throne of God; and unless those who are the objects of God's hate stand out of the way, by releasing the oppressed, those arrows will pierce them through, and thus the system will be drowned in blood. This is no fancy, but a stern reality. The signs of the times clearly indicate it. The sin of slaveholding has become unbearable, and high-priests of truth and righteousness, are being raised up all over the land, who will lead them on to victory.

I regard this as the most auspicious day the American slave ever saw. The sun of his ighominy is about to set, and on the morrow it will rise upon him as a *man* and a *brother*. God hasten the day.

I have endeavored to show, by the case of Athaliah, what is the duty of the American people. Will they do it *now*? Or must they still compromise? "Now is the accepted time." We do not know that we will have any other time.

Bryan, O., Jan., 13, 1860.

W. A. H.

SLAVERY AGITATION AND THE NEW YORK HOTELS.—The New York *Herald* having stated that the hotels of the city were suffering from the loss of Southern support, the *Evening Post* has ascertained, from the books of the principal establishment, that the report is unfounded. With but one-exception, all the great hotels are quite as prosperous as at this time last year, notwithstanding the opening of the new Fifth Avenue Hotel, which is the largest in the city.

#### Idolatry in the United States.

The Chinese in San Francisco have a heathen temple which cost \$20,000, and at a cost of \$30,000 have imported an idol from China, representing a great statesman and warrior who lived three hundred years ago.

Are these the only idolators in America?

JOHN BROWN IN MINNESOTA.—The slave Democracy in the Minnesota Legislature hoped to make political capital out of the Harper's Ferry invasion, and to this end introduced resolutions denunciatory of that act of lawlessness. The Republicans amended the resolutions by adding a severe rebuke of the disunion Democratic orators in Congress. In this form the resolutions passed, to the great chagrin of the servile Democracy.—*National Era.*



# The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1860.

## Positions of Henry Ward Beecher.

"He held that a man might hold a slave and not do wrong. This must be the case until time was annihilated. There might be formalities, and whether they took seconds, days or weeks, time must be consumed. Such a thing as immediate emancipation was impossible. There was nothing bad or good *per se*. A thing was bad if its consequences were bad, and *vice versa*, and all things were to be judged by their tendency to good or bad."

The above is from the speech of Mr. BEECHER, in the discussion concerning the American Board by the Plymouth Church, Jan. 23, as reported in the *N.Y. Times* of the next morning. It is the old doctrine of gradualism over again, and standing in its proper logical connection, with the doctrines, 1, that slavery "is not *sin per se*" in other words, is not sin in itself; and, farther 2, with the still more comprehensive doctrine that there is *nothing* that is *sin per se*, sin in itself; because all the sinfulness (or criminality) of sin lies, not at all in itself, in its own nature, but only in the tendency or consequences of sinning. Or, in commercial parlance, that nothing is sinful, so long as it will pay.

We thank Mr. Beecher for his frankness, and we honor him for his philosophical accuracy, in placing these things together, where they belong, where they can be looked at, and seen, just as they are. Of gradualism we have heard enough all along, for thirty years past. So also of the doctrines that slavery is not "*sin per se*," sin in itself. Equally familiar have we been, all that time, with the philosophy of utility or expediency, as taught by Hobbs, Hume, Godwin, and Voltaire, as the foundation of virtue, and with equal clearness and success, by Bishop Law, Arch-deacon Paley, and Rev. Dr. Taylor of New Haven. We were aware, somewhat vaguely perhaps, of the ethical affinity between these several propositions. Mr. Beecher has shown us, more clearly, the consecutive relation between them. His argument before an intelligent church, required him to do this. The American Board was to be vindicated. It was only on the ground of gradualism that this could be done. But gradual emancipation, involving a continuance of slavery, was to be justified in no way but by maintaining that slaveholding is not, in itself, sinful. And this in its turn, could be maintained only by taking the broader ground that no practice is, in itself sinful (or blame worthy) on its own account, or for what it is in itself, but only on account of the consequences resulting from it. We do not suppose that Mr. Beecher, on this occasion, or for the first time, or for the mere purpose of carrying a point, adopted these several theories. But, having before held them, he knew how to string them together for service, when service was required of them.

Here then are his positions:

1. Gradual emancipation, involving present continuance, in slaveholding; the present existence of slavery. This he advocates in opposition to immediate emancipation.
2. Slavery, or slaveholding, is not bad, in itself.
3. Nothing is bad in itself, but bad only on account of its bad tendencies, results, effects, consequences.

Against each of these we might advance separate arguments. Against the first we might bring the heaven-revealed duty of immediate and unconditional repentance and reformation. "Now, is the accepted time." "Execute judgment in the morning" without delay. We might say, in the use of his own words, that failing to insist on this, slavery must continue to exist, and be innocent, "until time is annihilated." We might reverse his statement and affirm that all emancipation *except* immediate emancipation is impossible, and has never been witnessed. Against the second proposition we might urge, that if slavery, or if slaveholding, be not sin in itself, then it is not sin, at all, since nothing can be sinful out of itself, or sinful in something else.

But, since the first two propositions repose for their support on the third, as Mr. Beecher himself evidently understands; we may as well come direct, to that point, and see whether that proposition can stand.

"There is nothing bad or good *per se*," nothing good or bad in itself, and *vice versa*, all things are to be judged (pronounced good or bad) "by their tendency to good or bad."

By the terms "bad or good" in the beginning of the sentence, we suppose Mr. Beecher means wrong or right, innocent or sinful. And by the same terms, near the close of the sentence, we suppose he means the misery or the happiness resulting from wrong or right actions. Otherwise there would be nothing intelligible in his statement. He does not mean to say that all things are to be judged right or wrong according to their tendency to right or wrong—nor that all things are to be judged miserable or happy by their tendencies to misery or happiness. Such statements would be mere tautology and verbiage.

The meaning then, is this, "There is nothing right or wrong *per se*." A thing tending to misery is wrong, and *vice versa*, and all things are to be judged by their tendency to misery or to happiness.

This is equivalent to the proposition that there is no right nor wrong, no holiness nor sin, in the universe. If the moral quality or essence of right, or of holiness, does not lie in itself, then it lies nowhere. If the moral quality or essence of wrong, or of sin, does not inhere in itself, then it inheres nowhere. The one cannot inhere in happiness, nor the other in misery. It is confusion of language as well as of ideas, a confounding of moral distinctions as well as of the meaning of words, so to identify sin with suffering, and happiness with virtue, as to deny the distinction between them, and to transfer praise and blame from the one to the other. The heaven established connection between them does not make them one and the same thing, for this would render such connection impossible.

The man who does a mean act is guilty of that mean act, and blame worthy and self condemned on account of it, irrespective of the misery that his mean act is likely to produce. The man who performs a right, a noble act, is virtuous in consequence of it, deserves approbation, and has the approbation of his own conscience, irrespective of the tendency or effects of his action.

Ingratitude, envy, malice, revenge, are in themselves, wrong, sinful, and blame worthy, whatever may be the effects they may produce. And the opposites of these vices are virtues, and are lovely and commendable in their own nature, irrespective of their tendency to produce happiness.

In other words "right and wrong," "holiness and sin," are terms that express *existing realities*, having distinct characters of their own, deserving complacency or aversion, praise or blame, without stopping to inquire after the consequences flowing out of them. The things themselves, not their consequences merely, draw forth the commendation and sympathy of God and of good men.

God loves the right because it is right; he hates the wrong because it is wrong. From this cause, for this reason, God rewards the right, and punishes the wrong, by connecting happiness with the one, and misery with the other. He does not love the right, because he has appointed for it a reward; neither should we. He does not hate the wrong because he has provided for it a punishment, neither should we.

Every divine threatening of punishment is an expression of God's hatred for a temper or act that is wrong or sinful in itself. Otherwise he would not punish it. For he punishes not, without a good reason. He punishes nothing that is not deserving of punishment. Every divine promise of reward is an expression of God's love of righteousness, virtue, or true holiness; and he loves it for what it is, in itself. Otherwise he would not reward it. His rewards are not without a good reason.

There is, then, a right, and a wrong, in the nature of things. And human acts, have, in themselves, a moral quality, irrespective of their consequences. All moral acts are either right or wrong, in themselves, *per se*. Slaveholding is a moral act, as it is the act of one moral being toward another moral being. That act is either right or wrong.

It is either right in itself, or else it is sin in itself; right *per se*, or wrong and sinful, *per se*. "All unrighteousness is sin." If slaveholding is right, if it be innocent, then it should be commended and protected by law. If wrong, it should be condemned and forbidden, excluded from the Church as a sin, and suppressed by the State, for the necessary protection of men's dearest and most essential rights.

From all this, it is easy to deduce the duties of Churches, Ministers, and Missionary Boards. If the American Board has treated slaveholding as sin, in itself, and as being hateful and offensive to God, then it has done right. If other-

wise, then it has done wrong. If the Pilgrim Church in Brooklyn, with its pastor, have regarded and treated the act of slaveholding, or man-stealing (for the terms are synonymous) as God regards and treats it, they have done right. If not, they have done wrong.

## PETITIONS FOR A LIBERTY BILL.

From Brooklyn [Eastern District, late Williamsburgh], petitions for a Personal Liberty Bill have been forwarded to the N. Y. Legislature at Albany, containing above five hundred names. The number might have been indefinitely increased, but for the want of volunteers who could spare the time to carry the petitions from door to door. As most of the active business men, in this District, do business in New-York City, they could be found at home only mornings and evenings. A large portion of the names obtained were those of shop-keepers and mechanics. Nearly half of the names were obtained by two young ladies. With a dozen or two of such laborers, quite a sensation at the Capitol might have been produced. As it is, we are cheered with the discovery of what, with adequate efforts, may be done.—It is found that the numerous German population are generally quite ready to sign. And one of the gentlemen who canvassed his neighborhood, [Green Point] reports that he obtained the signatures of more Democrats than Republicans. He accounts for it by the considerations that Republican politicians, at this juncture, are especially solicitous to get rid of the charges brought against them, of being abolitionists; whereas the Democratic aspirants, relying on the good odor of their party, at Head Quarters, are under less necessity to be over cautious in the matter. And everybody, almost, inwardly abominates the Fugitive Slave bill, and would gladly help fugitives.

## PETITIONS FOR SLAVERY IN NEW-YORK!

We learn that petitions are circulating in New-York City, asking the State Legislature to re-enact the "Nine Month's Law," by which slaveholders may again be permitted to hold their slaves in this State for nine months. It is well known that under that enactment, slaves were held year after year, by an easy evasion of the act. When the "nine months" were nearly expired, the master would take his slave across the Jersey City ferry, bring him immediately back, and thus renew the term, for nine months longer, and so on, as long as he pleased. The real object of the movement is to establish a precedent and a principle by which New-York may again be made a slave State. The real issue is beginning to be understood. The "irrepressible conflict" is coming on, in good earnest. All the States are to be free States, or all of them are to be slave States. There is to be no middle ground, and politicians might as well be apprized of the fact, and prepared to take their stand, on the one side or the other.

Mr. O'CONOR is progressing bravely. Having affirmed the justice and rightfulness of "Negro slavery" he finds himself driven to the necessity of defending that position by denying the foundation fact, the constructive principle of negro slavery from which its whole code is derived; the removal of which would be the abolition, root and branch, of the entire system, namely, *human chattelhood*! When Mr. O'Conor gets the assent of his clients to this, he will have terminated "the anti-slavery agitation" by transforming the slaveholders to abolitionists. Success to him! The following is from Mr. O'Conor's reply to Evarts, on the trial of the "Lemmon Slave case" before the Court of Appeals, at Albany.

"My friend says virtually that nothing is slavery except the bondage and subjection of man to man, in the most odious form that can possibly be conceived—an ownership, sheer, pure, absolute, and complete. And such, indeed, is the state of slavery, as it has existed in some stages of the world's history—being the slavery of free born white men to their own countrymen, their own color and class—their natural equals in all things. That pure slavery does indeed carry with it all the consequences of which my friend speaks. The master absolutely owns his slave; he has power over his life; he may torture him, he may slay him, and he is answerable to no one, any more than the patriarch in ancient times was answerable for exercising the same power over the child of his own loins. That is slavery, pure and simple, whether applicable to the negro or white man. But it is such a kind of slavery as does not exist and never has existed within this Union—such as never did exist within our territory, and

never will exist or establish such as to render the term "ownership" words are up to slavery is the purpose that this phrase very which is as long as ter to the Therefore, the about from might be tor of which judg in former tim try. "Chate to figure in a fraudulent p

Every one States, know step, amplif Judge Taye of the Slave white man "no rights a one could and might w

Are a rare tunity of her Lecturers w and ease of f ject, in all its siasm in the with him, an some degree

His first le guage, curio wit, and Hin cal peculiari of India, the he described singing. Hi hood. Caste more than te cultivated by tian preacher these are fro system, had competent to them, in the

Caste, said religious inst authority, th er. This re poses on per sanctioned b be maintaine are not perm their country periors. Th and can own even permitt min for a So and monkey white man i Christ enters heathenism i America. S Two more

Died at H in the 89th y Dec. 20, 177 was, for mar hopeful conv time he has eadly devoted nist, in his t lence, stated,



never will exist, and is not claimed by any one to be enforced or established. The slavery which exists within this Union is such as to render hardly proper, in strictness of language, the term "owner," or the term "property." Neither of these words are applicable to the slave himself, and the phrase chattel slavery is a mere cavil. Indeed, it is wholly false. It is for the purpose of misleading the passions of this giddy multitude that this phrase was coined by weak or wicked men. The slavery which does exist in these United States, and which will exist as long as they are the United States, is a right in the master to the services of the slave, or servant; and that is all. Therefore, this abhorred slavery that my learned friend reads about from "Taylor on the Civil Law," under which the slave might be tortured for evidence and might be put to death—all of which might have been executed upon a child by the parent in former times—is a thing unknown to our law or in our country. "Chattel slavery" is a raw head and bloody bones evoked to figure in speeches on the bustings. It is a phrase uttered for fraudulent purposes and with the most pernicious results.

Every one acquainted with the Slave Codes of the Slave States, knows that they emphatically affirm and, at every step, amplify and enforce what Mr. O'Connor here denies. Judge Taney, in his Dred Scott dictum affirms this condition of the Slave as predicable of every colored man whom any white man may choose to chattelize, when he says he has "no rights which a white man is bound to respect." Such a one could have no right to exemption from Chattelhood, and might with impunity be held and treated as a Chattel.

#### Dr. Scudder's Lectures on India.

Are a rare treat to those who are favored with an opportunity of hearing them. He is one of the most accomplished Lecturers we have ever heard. Gifted with great fluency and ease of expression, with a perfect knowledge of his subject, in all its vastness and variety, and kindling with enthusiasm in the presentation of it, he carries his hearers along with him, and makes them see, and understand India, in some degree, as he, himself, does.

His first lecture was upon the races of India, their language, curious customs; Fakirs, Indian hermits, Hindoo wit, and Hindoo women. His second, was upon the physical peculiarities and beauty of the country. The literature of India, the athletes and jugglers of Hindoostan. In this, he described Hindoo travelling, mode of writing, poetry and singing. His third lecture was upon the Brahmic priesthood. Caste. Description of a visit to a temple covering more than ten acres of ground. The Brahmins are highly cultivated by education, and intellectual. The native christian preachers exhibit great originality and tact. Some of these are from the lower castes, who, under the Hindoo system, had been excluded from education, but are now competent to grapple with the proud Brahmins, and silence them, in the presence of the people.

Caste, said Dr. Scudder, is, originally and essentially a religious institution, reposing upon the sacred books, for its authority, though protected and enforced by the civil power. This reminded us that the American caste system reposes on perverted interpretations of our Scriptures, and is sanctioned by a corrupted religion, otherwise it could not be maintained by the State. The Soodrahs like our slaves, are not permitted to read or hear the "Sacred books," of their country, but must learn their duty only from their superiors. They may not intermarry with the higher castes, and can own no property, except dogs. [Our slaves are not even permitted to own them.] The contempt of a Brahmin for a Soodrah, knows no bounds, while cows, peacocks and monkeys, are objects of adoration. ["No rights that a white man is bound to respect!"] "Where the love of Christ enters," says Dr. Scudder, "caste goes out." Such is heathenism in India—the counterpart of heathenism in America. Speedily may both fall!

Two more lectures remain.

#### OBITUARY.

DIED at Hudson, Ohio, Jan. 25th, EPHRAIM STRONG Esq., in the 89th year of his age. He was born in Southbury, Conn. Dec. 20, 1771, and graduated at Yale College, 1792. He was, for many years, a merchant at Greensboro. Vt. His hopeful conversion to Christ occurred in 1806, since which time he has been, wherever his abode, intelligently and earnestly devoted to the service of his Lord. He was a Calvinist, in his theology, active and systematic in his benevolence, stated, in his seasons of prayer, both in family and

in private, an example as a parent, in his fidelity to his children, to teach them the way of life. He was the father of six sons and two daughters who grew to maturity, of whom, three sons and both the daughters died in the Lord, before him; while all his surviving children and many of his grand children are the professed disciples of Christ. His last days were truly his best, walking with God, he came to his grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season.—[Communicated.]

We cannot forbear to add our personal testimony to the intelligent, earnest, consistent, and practical piety of EPHRAIM STRONG, for many years a steady patron of our publications, and frequent correspondent. Once, a few years ago, we enjoyed the privilege of a night's entertainment at his hospitable residence, and were greatly edified by his truly evangelical conversation. On all the living issues of the day he was perfectly at home, and had taken a decided stand for radical reform. He deeply deplored the decline of practical godliness and true piety, the departure of the Churches and Ministry in general from the living faith of their fathers, in neglecting to reprove popular and profitable sins, especially the enslavement of human beings. The Constitution of his country he interpreted in the light of its own Preamble and the Declaration of Independence. And consequently he saw no constitutional obstacle to a National deliverance of the oppressed, in accordance with the explicit requirements of God's word, which he held paramount to all human legislation and compacts. On these and other moral, religious, and political topics, his letters took the strongest ground, expressing his views with a strength, clearness, and compactness, well symbolized by his bold, exact, neat, and unequivocal hand-writing. He was a Christian and a patriot of the Old Revolutionary stamp, and one of the last of them that survived. May his mantle fall on all his descendants, and on the generation of their contemporaries. We could ask nothing better for the cause of true religion, and of civil and religious freedom. A generation of such men would be a commencement of the Millennium. God speed the day.

MR. STRONG, was a lineal descendant from "ELDER STRONG" one of the Puritan Pilgrim emigrants, arriving not long after the May-flower. Sometime previous to his removal to Ohio, he resided in Monroe county, Western New York.

MR. CLINGMAN'S SPEECH.—We acknowledge the receipt, under frank of Hon. Thos. L. Clingman, of North Carolina, of his speech "against the revolutionary movements of the Anti-Slavery party, delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 16, 1860," printed at the Congressional Globe office. We hope to find time and room for some further notice of it, in our columns.

## News of the Day.

### LEGISLATURE OF VIRGINIA.

A Joint Committee of both Houses of the Legislature, on "Harper's Ferry outrages," has elaborated an intensely radical pro-slavery document, occupying nearly six close printed columns of the N. Y. Herald, for Jan. 30, inclusive of a so-called "Non-Intercourse Bill," introduced into the Legislature by the Finance Committee. The Report of the Joint Committee closes with the following:

Your Committee, therefore, recommend to the General Assembly, the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the appropriate standing committee of the two houses of the General Assembly be instructed to prepare and report such bills as in their judgment may be necessary to organize, arm and equip the militia of the State for active and efficient service.
2. Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to prepare and report such bills as in their judgment may be most effectual (without violating the provisions of the Constitution of the United States) in encouraging the domestic manufactures of our own State, promoting direct trade with foreign countries, and establishing, as far as may be practicable, our commercial independence.
3. Resolved, That the committees for courts of justice be instructed to report such bills as may be necessary to secure the more prompt and effectual punishment of all foreign emissaries and others who may be found guilty of conspiring against the peace of our community, or seeking to incite our slaves to insurrection.

The Bill from the Finance Committee, entitled "a Bill making regulation's concerning special licences," is quite elab-

orate and complex in its provisions. We are not quite certain that we fully comprehend the practical results expected to be reached by them. But we cannot understand how "without violating the provisions of the Constitution of the United States," Virginia can pass an Act of Non-Intercourse with Non-Slaveholding States, or with any portion of their citizens. But this is a matter for Virginians to look after "Non-Intercourse" Acts seldom annoy anybody but their inventors. If Virginians can do without New York merchandize, New Yorkers can do without their custom.

A SPEAKER ELECTED.—Mr. Pennington of New Jersey, (Republican) is elected Speaker of the House of Representatives by a majority of one vote.

Thus have the pro-slavery, Anti-democracy for the second time been defeated in the choice of Speaker, after a disorganized struggle of two months. This should suffice them. And now that the House has a Speaker, the House and the country will not, probably, be bored by so much bunkum speaking.

DESTRUCTIVE FIRE.—On Sunday morning a fire broke out in the building, 48 Ann Street, occupied by Mr. Robert Bonner, proprietor of the New-York Ledger, and extended through to 133 Fulton Street. Mr. Bonner's loss is about \$30,000, insured for 20,000. A part of the building was occupied by Messrs. Wynkoop, Hallenbeck & Thomas, steam job printers, who estimate their loss at \$80,000, insured for \$61,000. The proprietors of the Mercury, estimate their loss at \$5,500, of which \$1000 are insured. Other proprietors of publications printed at that office were sufferers, viz. of Bradstreet's Commercial Report, loss \$3,000, insured for \$1500, &c., Mr. Geo. Bruce, type founder, owned the building, loss \$15,000, insured for \$10,000. The fire extended to 46 Ann and 115 Fulton Sts., occupied by Messrs. Ward, Close & Co., wholesale druggists, loss \$35,000, fully insured. Some other buildings were injured, and contents damaged. Total loss estimated at \$175,000.

MEETING OF THE LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE.—THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.—New Orleans, Jan. 19.—The Governor's message was transmitted to the Legislature of this State yesterday. The Governor recommends that the State be prepared to meet her sister States of the South in Convention, in case certain contingencies be complied with. He favors retallating the hostility of the North by licensing and inflicting discriminations against Northern goods amounting to an absolute prohibition. The House passed a joint resolution declaring that the Harper's Ferry affair was an attack upon the rights and privileges of the South, and showing the hostility of the North. The Governor says he considers that the election of a Republican President is a cause for a dissolution of the Union.

THE ATTEMPT TO INTRODUCE SLAVERY INTO MINNESOTA.—The bill in the House, introduced by Mr. Sweet of Sauk Rapids, and supported so vehemently by Col. Robertson, of St. Paul, to insidiously permit slavery in Minnesota, was yesterday voted down by 57 to 12. Our reporter has not given the names of the 12 Democrats who voted for the atrocious proposition. We must obtain them, however, and let our readers see hereafter the dozen Democrats who sought to vote slavery into Minnesota. There is no doubt about two of them—George W. Sweet and Col. D. A. Robertson. Mark the enemies of liberty and humanity!—St. Paul Minnesotan, 5th. Jan.

COLORING PERSONS IN SOMERSET CO., MD.—The citizens of Quantico district, Somerset county, Md., at a recent public meeting adopted resolutions disapproving of the practice of hiring slaves of masters, with the provision that the slaves first give their consent, and protesting against allowing hired slaves the use or employment of their own time. It was also resolved, that the constables of the district should arrest every colored person found in possession of firearms, and all white or colored persons of a suspicious character, who are to be compelled to give an account of themselves.—Balt Sun.

THE WIFE OF GEORGE W. BROWN, editor of the late Herald of Freedom, has filed her petition in the District Court of this county for a divorce, charging the said Brown with adultery on several occasions, once in his office and once in his own house, and with inhuman treatment, such as to render her condition intolerable.—She has retained Judge Smith and S. N. Wood, Esq., as her attorneys.

This George W. Brown is the creature whose slanders against the noble old John Brown, were so industriously circulated by the pro-slavery press at the East. He is also the creature who, during his editorial career, maligned nearly every prominent Free-State man in Kansas.—Lawrence [Kan.] Repub.



## THE PERSECUTION AT THE SOUTH.

FROM NORTH CAROLINA we learn that the mania of pro-slavery persecution still continues and is extending. Numbers of respectable citizens are arrested, on mere suspicion, and held to bail or imprisoned. Among the poorer people, many are known to sympathize with the imprisoned missionary, Rev. Daniel Worth; but in North Carolina, as elsewhere, the poor have little influence, and the persecution is unchecked. The friends of Mr. Worth think him safer in prison than he would be, if at large, and exposed to the outrages of Lynch law and mobs.

Further particulars will be found in the following.

Letter from a Lady to an Officer of the American Missionary Association.

GUILFORD COUNTY, N. C., Jan. 13, 1860.

At present we are circumstanced something like the children of Israel, when they started for the Land of Promise, pursued by Pharaoh and his host, with the Red Sea before them, and mountains on either hand. Still we hope to see the salvation of the Lord, relying on the arm of Jehovah for protection.

I suppose, ere this, you have seen some account of the Rev. D. Worth's arrest and commitment to prison, in Greensboro, Guilford County, N. C., charged with circulating incendiary books, &c., principally the "Impending Crisis," by Helper, which seems to be attracting more attention, at present, than all other books put together.

Brother Worth was arrested on the 23d of last month, had a preliminary trial before three magistrates on the 24th, which resulted in his commitment to prison to await further decision at the Spring Term of the Superior Court. There was great excitement during his trial; three lawyers appeared in behalf of the State; the prisoner pleaded his own cause in an able manner—his enemies themselves being Judges. Since then, there have been five other arrests of citizens of this county for circulating "Helper," most of them under heavy bonds, but all admitted to bail except the first. The nature of the bonds required of him was considered unreasonable. The first was a bond of \$5,000 for his appearance at the Spring Term, which was complied with; the other was \$5,000 also, requiring him not to preach at all. This is not complied with, yet. Not content with the above, he was arrested again, in prison, and brought out yesterday before Judge Dick, and bound in the sum of \$5,000 to appear at the Spring Term, in Randolph County, in March. His enemies seem determined to push the law to the furthest extremity, but the old veteran has been happy beyond description, and filled with joy unspeakable.

His keepers observe the strictest vigilance, not allowing even his wife to speak a word to him without witnesses being present; nor do they suffer him to write a word to any person, only what passes under their inspection. They made an attempt yesterday, during his trial, to deprive him of the means of writing at all; but finally concluded to let him have two or three sheets of paper at a time, by his giving an account to the Sheriff what disposition he made of it. One object seems to be to cut off all correspondence with friends, and indeed all the friends of Liberty here must suffer likewise. They say that it is against the law to say slavery is wrong, and they have pronounced the woe; the decree has gone forth against all such offenders. I trust and believe there is a remnant who will trust and fear God more than man, even in this land of intolerance and usurpation; and I hope that all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity will remember us at the Throne of Grace, that we may be able to withstand all the fiery darts of the wicked; also, that our aged minister may be delivered from wicked and unreasonable men.

We feel deeply grateful for the interest manifested toward us by the American Missionary Association. May the blessing of the Most High attend your labors of love, is the prayer of your distant friend.

## FROM KENTUCKY.

Rev. J. G. Fee, and some others, after being driven from Berea, Madison Co., Ky., went from Cincinnati to Bracken Co., on the Kentucky side of the Ohio River. This was the vicinity of Mr. Fee's birth place, and the scene of his earlier labors in the ministry. They hoped to be able to remain there, and prosecute their work without molestation. The following extracts from a letter of Mr. Fee to one of the Secretaries of the American Missionary Association, dated Germantown, Bracken Co., Jan. 25th, show that their hopes were not well founded:

"I am enduring a great trial. The floods come over me. I am again to be driven out, by a more overwhelming force than was in Madison County. Last Monday it was supposed there came from eight hundred to a thousand people at the County seat. With almost unanimous rush the mass gathered from the two counties, (I am near the Mason County

line,) and resolved to drive me out. Some ten or twelve days are given us to leave. A Committee of one hundred men are appointed to come and warn us to go. I have sought counsel of the Lord, and of friends. There can be no human protection. I am to be driven out from one of the best communities in the State.

"A few days since, I went to Germantown, to talk with the leading influential citizens. I desired to meet them face to face to talk over the positions I assume, and the evils of mob-violence. Brother Humlong, a man of true excellence, went with me.

We called and talked freely with many. A physician, of commanding position in society, speaking of the people of Bethesda, friends of the Church, said, "I wish to Heaven, all Kentucky was as that neighborhood." "The people," said he, "are industrious, quiet, upright citizens," and then repeated his wish! Now from this scene of thrift I must be driven, from relatives, from the dear brethren and sisters in the Church; and friends around. Also from the plan or prospect of building up churches in Kentucky, and, still harder, from the prospect of carrying to the people of Kentucky, the only Gospel that can save. I can understand, now, why the Saviour wept over Jerusalem, as he saw that people about to push the cup of Salvation from them. Oh, how I wish I could be with you, to tell the anguish of my heart for others, and to plan for the future. The giving up of property, home, all earthly considerations, are not so painful as the idea of giving up these churches, and the privilege of laboring directly with and for the people of Kentucky. How shall I go away, and give up this work? I cannot give it up. I must only change my place of labor for a time. For years I have had unceasing care and toil to get things so established here, that I could have a prospect of their standing. Other brethren have toiled for a like object. We hoped then to have rest of spirit, and to rejoice in that reaped growth, which we then expected to see when we should have lived down much of the opposition, and seen confidence secured. The rest has not yet come. The viper that now stings, has been nurtured into strength in the bosom of the denominations around us. Church and State have been warmed into life that which is now poisoning their vitals, and ruthlessly destroying all law and order. The abomination of desolation is working. Can, Oh can this nation be roused to the work of exterminating this monster, Slavery? It can be done by means peaceful and legitimate, if Christians and philanthropists will only, at once, do their duty, in Church and State.

"Brothers Hanson, Griffin, Mallett, Holman, and Robinson, are ordered to leave here. Brother Davis (Rev. J. S. Davis of Cabin Creek, Lewis Co.,) is also driven out. A tremendous meeting for that purpose, preceded the one held here."

The following corroborates the preceding letter of Mr. Fee, and records the consummation of the event.

## Expulsion of Citizens from Kentucky.

CINCINNATI, Tuesday, Jan. 31.

Eighteen citizens of Mason and Bracken Counties, Kentucky, have been expelled from the State, on account of their opinions on slavery. Most of them arrived here yesterday.

## SECURITY AGAINST COUNTERFEITS.

W. L. Ormsby, in the N. Y. Times, replies to 'Mercator,' in the same paper, in opposition to his project of uniform plates for all the banks. He says:

"Now, instead of gaining security this would actually increase counterfeiting precisely 331 times.

"This is as old as the patch-work and die system itself. 'Perkins' stereotype plates' were made on this plan. All the Banks in the New England States were at one time obliged by law to use them. But when one counterfeit was successfully made on one bank, it was virtually a counterfeit on all. That such a system tempts counterfeit precisely in proportion to the extent of circulation and number of Banks using the system, was also proved in this very State of New York when the general Banking law first went into operation. The law authorized the Superintendent of the Bank Department to get 'all plates engraved in the best manner to prevent counterfeiting.' On applying to bank note engravers for a 'best manner,' (not knowing anything about it himself,) he was induced to adopt one uniform plan throughout the State,—that is, all the one dollar denominations for

all banks were alike, and so on with all others. The only variation from Perkins' plan consisted in compelling each new bank to pay for a full set of steel plates, the dies for which were already on hand, and were paid for by the first new bank that organized! The plan increased counterfeiting in proportion to the number of banks using it. Now it is a little remarkable that 'Mercator's' plan is even more dangerous than this; because he proposes that the notes shall 'differ only in number, date, and amount.' So that a counterfeit of the essential parts of one note, would be a counterfeit of all notes of all denominations in these parts.

Notwithstanding the danger to which 'Mercator's' plan would inevitably subject the banks and the public, I dare say that there is hardly a professional bank-note engraver in the country but would favor it, provided he could secure the job. But you may rely upon it that all the unsuccessful ones would make such an *expose* as would nip the project in the bud."

Mr. Ormsby, would seek security in the opposite direction. He would require each bank to procure "one whole picture, original in design and engraving."

Another writer in the Times, "Experience," says it is a mistake that there are not numerous counterfeits of the Bank of England. He also expresses the opinion that coins are as easily counterfeited as paper notes, and suggests that too little has been done to detect and punish the perpetrators of counterfeits.

THE ABOLITIONISTS IN NORTH CAROLINA.—We learn that Judge Dick is indefatigable in his efforts to bring the vendue and circulators of Helper's book to justice. He issued his warrant to the sheriff of Guilford, directing him to make a search in Randolph, and much additional evidence was obtained against Daniel Worth. The judge had him brought out of jail, examined him, and required him to give bail in \$5000 to answer at the next term of Randolph Superior Court for incendiary preaching, and for circulating incendiary documents in that county. Worth was remanded to jail in default of security.

Among other things it was proved that at a meeting held by Worth last summer, in Randolph, some white females had taken some chairs in front of his pulpit, and there were some negro women seated on benches in the rear of the pulpit. Before he began to preach, he ordered the white women to give up their chairs to the "black sisters," which was accordingly done.

We learn that Judge Dick has ordered the commanding officer to detail a guard for the Greensborough jail, so as to cut off all possibility of Worth's escape.

We learn further, that the prompt action taken with Worth, Wheeler, Harris, Turner and Vestal, has struck terror to the abolition incendiaries in that quarter.—*Randolph Standard*.

## Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.

WASHINGTON, Wednesday, Feb. 1.

The election of a Speaker to-day, was not attended by particular excitement, as it was known to be a foregone conclusion, and the excitement, too, had in a measure exhausted itself by its previous intensity. Previous to the announcement of the vote, Mr. Keit attempted to distract the Republicans, by announcing as a fact, that Mr. Pennington was in favor of the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, and had recommended it in a message, while Governor of New Jersey, which happened to be ten years prior to the passage of the law. The only effect of this announcement, was to convince those who had voted for Mr. Pennington, of his conservative and national sentiments, and thus justify the vote.

President Lord of Dartmouth College has been writing another letter in favor of Slavery. He says that New England will yet be compelled to introduce Slavery. The children and grand-children of the present Abolitionists, he says, may be the first to introduce a "harder serfdom than is yet known, unless, indeed, they should themselves be compelled to sell themselves for bread, and suffer the proper chastisement of their fathers' sins for their rebellion against the government of God." The editor of *The Independent Democrat*, of Concord, himself a graduate of Dartmouth, says that Dr. Lord is insane, and has been for years.

Some of the Southern papers, are reporting a touching story about a neglected daughter of Mrs. Lydia Maria Child. The story is bogus, as Mrs. Child has never had a daughter or son. She wrote the "Mother's Book," but never was a mother; is the author of "The Family Nurse," but never had a family.

The Rev. tucky Presby his nephew, He thinks th ces from dist affording the South.—*Nat*

THE KANS ment of the detail, in the gether with construction, was \$2,675.9 constructing The items stock paid in ted, make a

"M The Bes "M Sad Mig Tho All Rou Mu All But Tho All Wit Yet Not But Blo Mea Tho

The follow cease of the and relate, al time previous Wit "T "W "T "I You For It c 'Tw Fro Bet Ric It c Far To m The

A young n blessed to th teresting inci It is his cu service every is at once so be adopted by prayer, a thi one has taken



The Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge.—This distinguished Kentucky Presbyterian divine has written a long and able letter to his nephew, the Vice President, in favor of preserving the Union. He thinks the South would reap the most disastrous consequences from disunion, and alludes to the Harper's Ferry affair as affording the highest evidence of the value of the Union to the South.—*National Era*.

THE KANSAS CITY. *Metropolitan*, of the 5th inst., gives a statement of the trade of that city, showing the amount of sales in detail, in the various branches of business, for the year 1859, together with the number of houses erected and their expense of construction, in the same period. The total amount of sales was \$2,675,930 00 No. of buildings erected, 249. Expense of constructing buildings, \$346,770 00.

The items of business enumerated, together with the bank stock paid in, amount of city improvements and buildings erected, make a total sum of \$3,158,200.

## Family Miscellany.

For the Principia.

### "MEET AGAIN!"

"Meet again!" ah, shall we meet?  
These few days have been most sweet,—  
Beautiful, but passing fleet!

"Meet again!" ah me, how dreary,  
Sad my life would be, and weary,  
Might I never more be near thee!

Thou whose smiles have in them gathered  
All my life's lost rays, and scattered  
Round me gleams of joy unmeasured:

Must the night come, cold and cheerless,  
All its gloom I could meet, fearless;  
But its solitude—not tearless.

Thou my day art, night thy loss,  
All Earth's smiles and glittering dross  
Without thee, were but golden cross.

Yet God keep thee, dearest one,  
Not all for my poor sake alone;  
But better, dearer far,—thine own.

Blessings go with thee, ever, ever,  
Meet we soon, or meet we never,  
Thou shalt be beloved forever,

Fare thee well! x.

For "The Principia."

### "THE ROYAL TRAIN."

The following lines were written in reference to the decease of the late DEB. JAMES WARNER, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and relate, almost verbatim, some of his utterances, a short time previous to his departure.

With lifted hand, and upward eye—  
"Tis coming!" said he—soon to die:  
"What's coming?"—and he made reply,  
"The royal train—'tis coming nigh."

"I see it not."—"Oh no! In vain  
You look:—but I can plainly see:  
For me it comes, the royal train,  
It comes; and ready I must be."

'Twas coming.—Yes. In state sublime,  
From glorious heights 'twas wending down  
Between Eternity and Time,  
Rich laden with the Cross, the Crown.

It came, it pass'd and with its flight,  
Far from the abodes of woe and sin,  
To mansions of eternal light  
The royal train had borne him in.

W. G.

For The Principia.

### A TRUE STORY.

A young minister, whose labors of love have been greatly blessed to the lambs of his flock, relates the following interesting incident:

It is his custom to assemble these little ones for an hour's service every week. His manner of conducting the exercises is at once so simple and appropriate that we wish it might be adopted by every church and pastor. After the opening prayer, a child repeats a Bible verse, a second leads in prayer, a third repeats a Bible verse, and so on until every one has taken part in the meeting. This is agreeably inter-

spersed with the singing of hymns and relation of religious experience.

It was on one of these interesting occasions that a little girl remarked that she knew that the Lord heard her prayers. "How do you know?" inquired her pastor, surprised at the child's confidence.

"Because," she replied, "a few days ago, my school teacher required me to write a composition, I had never done such a thing in my life, and I did not think it possible; I could not think of anything to write about. I could not disobey my teacher. Remembering that Mr. J. had said, if we ask God for anything in faith, he will not deny us, I went into my closet, and there begged my Heavenly Father to aid me in my new duty.

"A subject came into my mind, and as I took my pen, words flowed faster than I could write them." "So," said she simply, "I have learned by experience that the prayer of faith is sure to be answered."

RED PARSONAGE.

For the Principia.

### THE MOTHER'S FAITH.

A FACT.

"I should like to know what Mother thinks of the Lord, now!" exclaimed a little boy of ten years, as a group of half-starved brothers and sisters were preparing for school, without a breakfast, one bitter cold morning.

Well knew each member of that hungry band of little ones, that through all the trying scenes of poverty, in their father's long illness, a firm and unwavering faith had upheld their praying mother. But now when the last fire had been made, and the last frugal meal of baked potatoes eaten, and her own frail form was sinking beneath its burden of work and sorrow, the climax seemed reached. "What does mother think of the Lord, now?" fell upon the ears of one of the loveliest women I ever met. It was from the lips of her first born, her darling, for whose submission to God she had ever been hoping and striving. The words fell upon her heart, like lead. It was a new test of her sorely tried faith, a new drop added to her bitter cup.

A long and severe sickness of her husband had reduced them to extreme poverty, and with no resource but the needle, it had been difficult to meet the demands of a large family, and perform sick room duties at the same time. When this eventful morning dawned, there was no more food in the house, and just wood enough to build one more fire. A slice of borrowed bread was toasted for the sick man, and his pillowed chair drawn before the last fire. He knew not the destitution, the toil, the self-sacrifice that oppressed his wife, he saw only the smiles, the industry, the neatness, and the patient waiting for brighter days.

When the daring words of the hungry boy fell upon that christian mother's ear, she just lifted up her heart, in the silent eloquence and fervor of ejaculatory prayer, known only to the toil-worn and working disciple. The answer came "The Lord is good, his mercy endureth forever." Her heart responded, and as she raised her eyes to the window, two good loads of wood standing there, testified that she had not thought too much of her Heavenly Father, or trusted in his promises too long. The sun shown again upon that household, and never more did Henry say, "I wonder what mother thinks of the Lord, now."

RED PARSONAGE.

### OLD TIMES AND NEW.

#### "THE CONTINENTAL OLD FOLKS."

MR. GULICK'S CHOIR of singers, attired in antique costume, gave a concert on Monday evening of last week, at the Odeon, in Williamsburgh, for the benefit of the Industrial School on North Second Street. The object was a worthy one, the entertainment promised to be—as it proved—an attractive and interesting one. The house was crowded, the audience, ourself and family included, well pleased, and everything "came off" as happily as could be desired. The Choir had taken great pains to prepare themselves, in the matter of singing as of dress, and a Choir of better singers, or led by a better Chorister, we could not reasonably desire. And yet, as the effort was to personate the Choirs of "Old Continental," Revolutionary, or Colonial times, we may indulge the privilege of an old man, whose father and grandfather were "Old Continentals," to criticise the performance at some points, and explain it at some others, lest "the rising generation should be misled in respect to the music and dresses of their ancestors.

The grotesque appearance of the choir, both ladies and gentlemen, should be attributed, in part, to the indiscriminate mingling together, in one group, of the various successive fashions extant, during a period of seventy years, the dresses of fifty years ago, with those, (as was stated) of one hundred and twenty years ago, with some of the intermediate fashions between them. As for example, the "gun-boat bonnet" of young ladies in Mr. Jefferson's time, say 1806, in honor of his favorite armament, which we well remember, was here paraded by the side of the three cornered cocked hats of their grandfathers, which had disappeared from circles of youthful fashion a full generation previous which it was not our privilege to witness. Another element of the ludicrous was the putting on the heads of some of the young ladies, the bonnets which were never made for nor used by young ladies, but only for and by their matronly mothers, or grandmothers, as the heavy structures and sombre hues bore witness. For the old ladies of former times, were not emulous to dress, and appear like young ladies, as many old ladies now do. Our modern dresses might be made to appear equally ludicrous, by jumbling together, in one group, the various fashions that have appeared within the last twenty years, the dresses of the old and the young, and all of them put on by the young. The best moral of this exhibition of dresses, was, the absurdity and bad taste of many of the ever fluctuating fashions, and tique and modern. We could not help remarking, by the bye, the absence from this exhibition, of the long bodice waists and ample round hoops of our Colonial grandmothers, and "Continental" grandmothers. The young ladies in the audience were not shown how, after a cycle of eighty or a hundred years, the cast off and long ridiculed fashions of their grand and great grandmother's had recently come into use again! The ludicrous effect was further intensified, by putting the very largest and heaviest bonnets, which had doubtless been made for the largest and tallest elderly ladies, upon the heads of small, and comparatively short young ladies, producing appearances never witnessed when the bonnets were first worn.

And so of the music. We expected to hear a specimen of the psalmody of the "Continental old folks" of the Revolutionary period, or of the previous Colonial times; such as Old Hundred, Windsor, Mear, Wells, Windham, Aylesbury, and the like; for this, incontestably, was the exclusive style of the Sabbath music of those times, a style which, after the prevalence of successive different styles, has, of later years, been in a degree revived and restored. Instead of this, we recognized not a single psalm tune, not a single piece of music, with the exception, perhaps, of Old Denmark, which, in the times of the Old "Continental" Congress, and previously, we could suppose to have been heard. Among the oldest of the tunes sung, and a noble one of the class, was "Majesty," common metre, which, though dismissed from the choirs before 1805 or 6, did not belong to the old Colonial times. The lively, rapid, fuge tunes, were an abomination to the venerable remnant of the cocked hat generation, when first introduced, and many of the "Continental Old Folks," were wont to put on their cocked hats, and walk out, when the chorister named them.

The venerable Dr. EMMONS who was one of the last survivors of the "Continental" generation, could never endure them, to the day of his death; nor the tenor and bass viol that came into use with them, and which figured so conspicuously in the performance of the modern "Continental Old Folks," at the Odeon. In the published volumes of Emmons, may be found one or more sermons on sacred music, in which the old, grave, solemn, choral style of psalmody is commended, the "new-fangled" lively, fuge style, with its "swells" deprecated, and the reasons assigned, in connection with criticisms well deserving the attention of Choristers, Teachers, Singers, and Composers of music, at all times. All the "Old Continentals" however, were not as rigid as Dr. Emmons, in respect to the use of musical instruments. We remember how good old Deacon Grow, (the grandfather of Hon. Galusha A. Grow, now in Congress,) remonstrated with some of his brethren and sisters in the Church, for their leaving the meeting, on account of the bass viol. "Come to meeting," said he, "in a devotional frame of mind, and the fiddle will not disturb you. It will be to you like David's Harp, of solemn sound." In time, the opposition relaxed. The "Old Continentals" were appeased by the occasional singing of Mear, Wells, or Old Hundred,



though much to the annoyance of the "young folks," who "did the singing," and who thought the old tunes a great bore. At Communion seasons, when the choir were not in their seats, the "old folks," down stairs, had it all their own way. Some old grandfather, of three and a half, or four score, with his white locks, would rise, and strike up the air of Windsor, or Old Hundred, the old ladies would chime in, the Minister and Deacons would follow, and sweeter, and more solemn music we have seldom heard, nor more free from anything like nasal twang. We well remember the feeling of awe it inspired in the contrast with the music of the choir—between fifty and sixty years ago. We remember too, the tales and anecdotes we then used to hear from older people, concerning the Sabbath music of olden times, when Old Hundred and Mear were in fashion, and all the congregation, hundreds of voices, sang together, and "old landlord Ingalls," pitched the tune. On a still summer's day, when the windows were open, the tune could be distinguished, it was said, for half-a-mile. And "Uncle Caleb," (somewhat of a wag,) would tell a story how a belated parishoner, on his way to meeting, through the woods, one day, was startled by a tremulous jar in the air, a quivering among the tree tops, and a snapping among the Chestnut boughs. What could be the cause, he could not imagine, till, emerging from the woods, the steeple, half a mile distant, loomed in sight, and on listening, the mystery was explained. The shrill tenor voice of landlord Ingalls was heard, high over all the congregation, singing Old Hundred!

The truth is, the age of the fuge music, and of the Jefferson gun-boat bonnets, was the very antipodes of the cocked hat age, the age of Mear, and Old Hundred. It was the age of strong revulsion from Puritan manners; an age in which "Young America," cut loose from the old moorings, was running half wild with novelties. It was an irreverent age, strongly tinctured with the French philosophy of that period. To the *Uncle Catebs* of that day, the solemn psalm tunes, and the solemn Theology of their fathers and grandfathers, were alike distasteful. Roguish lads in the singing-school, when sometimes set to the hated task of learning and singing the old tunes, would in half suppressed tones, vent their discontent by using an alteration of Watts,

"Pity the nations, &c.,  
That sing old Mear and Bray."

Any attempted imitation of the old Puritan "Continental" therefore, that represents them as singing the "Ode on science," in the extra rapid style, lately heard at the Odeon hits wide of the mark, striking in quite the opposite direction. The "old Continentals," never sang in the rapid style, never sang the "Ode on Science" at all, for it had not been composed until after their day, as one of its couplets bears witness.

"The British yoke, the Gallic chain,  
Were urged upon our sons in vain!"

The first allusion is to the Revolutionary struggle, the second, to the quasi war with France in the times of John Adams' administration. And those who *did* sing that ode never sang it in the extravagant style in which it was performed at the Odeon. The last two stanzas, were, indeed, of a livelier flow than the two former, but not so rapid, so lively, or so impassioned, as to prevent its preserving the dignity of the former, nor so as to prevent the unity and congruity of the piece, as a whole.

The burlesque singing of "Russia" "through the nose," as it is improperly termed (for the phenomenon is produced by a failure of the air to flow freely through the nostrils) was no correct representation of the psalmody, either of the "Continental" or of the generation that succeeded them. "Russia" was not one of the "Continental" tunes. And when it was sung, say fifty or sixty years ago, it was as well sung as it now is, and with as little of the nasal twang, as when the choir of Mr. Gulick, by way of a supposed contrast, performed it in their best style. We will go as far as any one in commending the performance of "Russia" and of "Denmark," at the Odeon. But we were accustomed to hear them as well performed in New England, fifty years ago. In fact, the last thirty or forty years have witnessed the best efforts of the best teachers and composers of music in this country, particularly in New England, the efforts of such men as Dr. Lowell Mason, for example, to restore the old Puritan style of music that prevailed in "Continental" times. They have indeed added some new and valuable

tunes, but mostly in the old Puritan style. And such has been the degree of success attending their efforts, that they are now encouraged to attempt a return to the old "Continental" and congregational singing of the audience, over the whole meeting house. When they shall have effected this, the era of "landlord Ingalls," the chorister, will be restored, though at the hazard, as Dr. Lowell Mason well understands, of now and then a harsh voice, a discordant note, and mayhap, an occasional nasal twang, which, for the sake of earnest psalmody, may be tolerated, on a principle as sound as that which induces eminent composers of music to intersperse a few discords, that the harmonies may, in the contrast appear the sweeter. The tradition of the nasal twang, as especially characteristic of the puritan conventicle, though apparently received by Cowper, rests on no better authority than that of the High Tory persecutors of the puritans, whose hatred of them was on account of their virtues.

On the whole, we cannot without proof, accept the theory that the age of the ascendancy of Handel and Mozart was far inferior to the present, in the matter of musical execution and taste. Nor can we consent to believe our own New England, of all the world, with its cherished preferences of the best sacred poetry and the best tunes of the times, constituted the exception, especially while it is known that Whitefield, fresh from the cathedrals of Oxford and London was astonished and delighted with New England Church music; that Lafayette, equally familiar with the best church music in France, was equally enthusiastic in praise of it, and that Washington, pausing to attend Sabbath Worship in a country meeting house was actually overwhelmed and wept like a child, during the singing. Accepting with gratitude the many improvements of these later times, we must be permitted to do justice to the memory of the past.

And in closing, we will suggest that Mr. GULICK, or some other chorister, might somewhat improve upon these exhibitions, by distinguishing between the music and the costumes of the "Continental" and of the generations that succeeded them, and devoting at least two separate evenings to distinct representations of each. For the first evening, the ladies should dress in silks or muslins, with long bodice waists, tight laced, just above the hips, large round hoops, much as now worn, large silk bonnets, no Leghorn nor straw, very high heeled shoes, with sharp pointed toes.\* The gentlemen with cocked hats, long hair with cues, or wigs, short breeches, knee-buckles, and shoe-buckles, large. The music should be exclusively of the old choral, grave, solemn style without fuge; sweet, full, sonorous, slow, and performed in the best style without instruments. Tunes, Old Hundred, Windsor, Mear, Wells, Windham, Bangor, Aylesbury, Little Marlboro', &c. For the second evening, ladies with Leghorn or straw bonnets, including "the gun boat" among other fashions, short waists, silk, muslin, or silk crape, high shell combs, morocco or kid shoes or slippers, either black, brown, green, lilac, or white. Gentlemen with round high hats, short white or light colored vests, short breasted coats, blue or mixed, with gilt buttons, tight pantaloons, blue or light colored, covered over with long Suwarrow boots, nearly up to the knees, highly polished, and surmounted with black silk tassels, white cravats, neatly tied, and ruffled shirts. Set them at singing the quick fuge tunes with a bass viol, a tenor viol, and, if you please a clarinet, let the music be good, lively, but not like a jig, or dancing tune, nor with the nasal twang.

The first evening will then represent the "Old Continentals;" the second, their children and grand-children, 50 or 60 years ago. Then, the historical truth will be more correctly represented and understood. And while recognizing a general improvement in good taste, since those periods, we should not confound opposites, nor fail to see that further improvements are yet to be made, chiefly in the direction of a nearer approximation to the simplicity of the Plymouth Rock Puritans, from their disuse of peruke, cue, or wig, before the non-conforming separating ministers consented to wear gown or band, or their church members conformed the fashions of cocked hats or high heeled shoes.

\* Intermediate, we think, between these two periods, was the time of ladies' fur hats, nearly resembling gentlemen's, except the crown, which was low, sometimes surmounted with a black feather, and occasionally tied under the chin. Farther remote were the high towering head dresses, which we are unable to describe.

#### SIN MAKES US AFRAID.

Why was Adam afraid of the voice of God in the garden? It was not a strange voice, it was a voice he had always before loved; but he now fled away at the sound, and hid himself among the garden trees. You can tell me why, I am sure. It was because he disobeyed God. Sin makes us afraid of God, who is holy; nothing but sin could make us fear one so good and so kind.—Have you not felt this kind of fear when Satan has tempted you to do wrong?

A child was one day playing alone in a drawing-room full of beautiful ornaments; he had often been told not to touch anything there, as they were of great value, and many of them were made of rare glass or china, and cost much money. He was usually an obedient boy, but on this particular day he was seized with a great desire to lift up the lid of a beautiful china jar, as he knew it was filled with sweetly scented rose-leaves. He left his toys, and went to the stand where the jar was placed. As he was too short to reach the lid, he climbed on a stool for the purpose; but just as his hand was on the lid of the jar he heard a sound, and starting, he let it fall from his hand. It was not broken, but cracked, and he thought that most likely no one would remark it; so, replacing it on the vase, he left the room. Day after day passed, but, although no notice was taken of the injury, he lived in constant fear of a discovery. Every time his aunt called him he started, and when he was in bed at night, if he heard but the rustle of her dress in the passage or on the stairs, he was frightened. Yet it was not his loving aunt, but his sin that made him tremble. She was always kind and gentle, and had never spoken a harsh word to her little nephew during his long visit at her house. At last the misery of concealment became so great that one day he told his aunt all, and the words she spoke to him then will never be forgotten. He learned from that week's remorse more of the nature of sin than in his whole life before. And as they knelt down and prayed to God for forgiveness, the child felt humbled and penitent, and lifted up his soul very earnestly that God would cleanse him from secret faults, and take away the love of sin from his heart.—Mrs. Geldart.

#### IF WE WERE A BOY AGAIN.

If I were a boy again, and on a farm, what would we do? That is the question we asked ourself the other day and sought to answer it. We did answer it—answered it promptly and emphatically. We would stay there—qualify ourself to stay on the farm, and no outside influence should prevent it. Every boy should have a motive for living—should determine that he will do, and labor to qualify himself to do it in the best manner possible. We would like to know that every boy who is intending to remain on a farm is preparing, and being assisted in the preparation, to labor intelligently there—is qualifying himself to be something more than a muscular farm laborer—is *thinking*, in fact, of what he sees, and resolving the reason of the processes which surround him. Just as soon as the boy begins to think—to study, or the man either, he will begin to be interested in his employment; and *not before*. No matter what his business, this is essential to success.—P. Farmer.

#### THE CROW.

"Down East" the crow is regarded as a great pest; so great that the genius of invention is taxed to produce all kinds of scare-crows, and yet the Atlantic Monthly dares to defend him in the following terms:—"He consumes in the course of the year vast quantities of grubs, worms, and noxious vermin; he is a valuable scavenger, and clears the land of offensive masses of decaying animal substance; he hunts the grass fields, and pulls out and devours the underground caterpillars wherever he perceives the sign of their operations, as evinced by the wilted stalks; he destroys mice, young rats, lizards and serpents; lastly, he is a volunteer sentinel about the farm, driven the hawk from its enclosures, thus preventing greater mischief than that of which he himself is guilty. It is chiefly in seed time and harvest, that the depredations of the crow are committed; during the remainder of the year we witness only his services and so highly are these services appreciated by those that have written of birds, that we cannot name an ornithologist who does not plead in his behalf.

#### WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the Principia:  
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols. .... \$1 50  
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol. .... \$1 00  
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol. .... \$0 75

TERMS CASH.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 109 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.